

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, and 15, which are independent, are amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically in paragraph [0074].

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. SUPPORT FOR THIS AMENDMENT

Citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided. However, such citations are provided merely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

As an example, support of the amendment can be found at paragraph [0074], which is reproduced as follows:

[0074] It is to be noted that the control port **120 d - 1** , if its functional block **120** constitutes the image-signal-processing apparatus **100** , reads any common commands stored in the ROM **120 d - 2** upon, for example, power application and transmits them

via the control bus **111** to the system control block **110** . With this, the system control block **110** can acquire the common commands related to all the functional blocks **120** that constitute the image-signal-processing apparatus **100** . It is to be noted that when one's own functional block **120** is in the chassis **101** or inserted into the corresponding slot, this functional block **120** is supposed to constitute the image-signal-processing apparatus **100** .

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 7,015,915 to Diard (hereinafter, merely “Diard”) and in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0019717 to Kondo et al. (hereinafter, merely “Kondo”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,719 to Nakatsugawa et al. (hereinafter, merely “Nakatsugawa”).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Diard and in view of Kondo and in view of Nakatsugawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,345,185 to Yoon et al. (hereinafter, merely “Yoon”).

Claims 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Diard and in view of Kondo and in view of Nakatsugawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,434,432 to Hao et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hao”).

IV. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, inter alia:

“wherein each of the plural functional blocks stores in an associated memory a correlation table that associates common commands corresponding to its own functions with block-specific commands, and at a power application, each of the plural functional blocks transmits common commands corresponding to its functions to the control block.” (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that Diard, Nakatsugawa, Kondo, Yoon, and Hao, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or render predictable the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, nothing is found in the references cited in the Office Action discloses or renders predictable **“wherein each of the plural functional blocks stores in an associated memory a correlation table that associates common commands corresponding to its own functions with block-specific commands, and at a power application, each of the plural functional blocks transmits common commands corresponding to its functions to the control block,”** as recited in claim 1.

Although Nakatsugawa has a command conversion table, Nakatsugawa stores only in the control block “the functional commands necessary for all compatible functional appliances predetermined to be mounted” (see Nakatsugawa, column 5, lines 10-15). In contrast, claim 1 requires that each functional block, rather than only the control blocks, stores a correlation table and transmits common commands from the functional block to the control block.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 14 and 15, which recite similar limitations with claim 1, are also patentable for similar reasons.

As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. As each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any
overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 

Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800